

NSW Government  
Planning & Environment  
Major Project Assessments  
Karl Fetterplace

**RE: SSD 17\_8544 CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT, GLEBE ISLAND**

I wish to submit my strong objection to the proposed concrete batching plant on Glebe Island.

Ignoring the obvious politics that is playing out in the background I object primarily, but not solely, for the following reasons.

**1. The EIS is biased and ignores impacts that exceed limits and has flawed assumptions and estimates**

The EIS document is inconsistent and ignores issues where they are covered by the Port Authority's right of use. Giving the impression that a limit set by the WHO or any other regulatory body does not apply in this instance. Does the Port Authority's right of use override world health standards? Also, areas that "just exceed" limits are deemed to be acceptable in the conclusions.

Predicted noise levels fall conveniently just below limits whilst previously measured levels have shown to be 2-4 times higher than those predicted in the report.

The document also risks being biased with a conflict of interest given that a disclaimer states "report is based on the information made available by the client" and "does not attempt to verify the accuracy, validity or comprehensiveness of any information supplied".

The REF states that the majority of truck movements will occur at night or in the middle of the day whilst the Port Authority itself has stated in meetings that it has no control over timing of movements as it will be based purely on demand.

**2. Noise, Light and Air Pollution**

Having lived adjacent to the site for 6 years I have experienced a great deal of ship movement at various times. I can state from experience that when ships are berthed at the site we suffer from noise, light and air pollution. I have had many sleepless nights from the increase in noise and light from the ship to shore operations. We have also experienced a fine covering of "dust" at these times on our outdoor furniture. Usually dependant on the wind and the product being delivered.

We accept the issues as they are today because the duty cycle of the occurrences is generally reasonably low and affords us quiet enjoyment of our home a majority of the time. A 24/7 facility with traffic as proposed would make our home unliveable. Sleep deprivation alone would have serious health impacts.

**3. Increased truck movements**

It has been stated that delivering this product direct to Sydney would save 140,000 long haul truck movements. This may be true but it does suggest that there will now be 140,000 truck movements originating from the plant based in the centre of Sydney. This is certainly contrary to plans to reduce the traffic in central Sydney.

Surely the Port Botany terminal would be a far better site choice as it is more conveniently situated with direct access to arterial roads and infrastructure to support large trucking volume.

#### **4. The proposal conflicts with the White Bay Master Plan 2000**

The development of the site as proposed directly contradicts a number of the key principles in the White Bay Master Plan:

- Enhanced Environmental Performance
- Provide noise, light spill, water quality, air quality and hazard risk control measures
- Deliver a high standard of urban design

#### **5. The proposed site is not currently a 24/7 facility**

Whilst the Port Authority has a 24/7 right of use for the site it has not operated in this manner for over 10 years. Vessels may, and do, currently arrive and operate at any time but at nowhere near the frequency currently proposed.

A significant residential development has been allowed directly adjacent to the site and constructed during this period with residents choosing to live here and accepting the CURRENT level of usage.

Whilst the Port Authority has a right to use the facility 24/7 it DOES NOT have a right to exceed regulatory requirements and globally recognised standards that support the now residents right to a healthy existence and peaceful enjoyment of their homes.

#### **In Conclusion**

In summary the proposal in it's current form is not acceptable and ignores the rights of thousands of adjacent Sydney residents.

The EIS that supports the proposal is grossly flawed and has been reverse engineered to meet the required outcomes. It also ignores elements that are covered by "right of use" and practical measurements of assumed inputs.

Even ignoring all aesthetic concerns there are very real issues around noise, light and air pollution that are already evidenced by current port operations.

Whilst I accept that this is a working port it is not appropriate to increase its level of operation as used for the past 10 years now that there will be a significant impact on a residential population that has been allowed to grow during this time.

Regards,  
Stephen Langton.